



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,618	12/18/2000	Juan C. Alvarado	59.0038	5812
23718	7590	02/18/2010		
SCHLUMBERGER OILFIELD SERVICES 200 GILLINGHAM LANE MD 200-9 SUGAR LAND, TX 77478			EXAMINER	DENNISON, JERRY B
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2443	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/741,618	Applicant(s) ALVARADO ET AL.
	Examiner J Bret Dennison	Art Unit 2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-152(e))
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 09/741,618 received on 11/27/2009.
2. Claims 1-12, 15-24 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Harvey did not disclose simultaneously reading data from a source file and also writing data from the source file into a buffer. Applicant asserts that even though Harvey disclosed a "real-time store and forwarding capability", this does not disclose a 'source file' or a 'buffer' or 'reading' or 'writing', or of doing so 'simultaneously.' Applicant attempts to justify this by showing that Harvey disclosed an engine that reads information from a continuously-updated source and passes it onto the client over HTTP(s) stream, and stating that "A continuously-updated source or presumably a source continuously written to is not the same as writing to a buffer from a source while simultaneously reading the source."

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As Examiner pointed out in the rejection, Harvey disclosed real-time store and forwarding transfers of file data from certain sites to central sites and ultimately to client devices.

Examiner specifically pointed out in Harvey that, "First, on the server side, real-time implies that the content being delivered is not static but is generated incrementally

based on information continually provided to the web server. This can be understood as a dynamic content generation engine that is reading information from a continuously-updated source (eg a growing serial file) and passing it on to the client over the HTTP(s) stream" (Harvey, col. 24, line 60 through col. 25, line 6). This citation clearly states that the web server performs the functions of reading from the file and passing it on to the client simultaneously. In other words, while the data is being continually provided to the web server, the web server continually provides it to the client.

Harvey further describes this real time store and forwarding in col. 9, lines 40-65 which recites "Real-time Transfers - the transfer express system moves the data to the receiving computer as it is being generated. This allows data transfer from an open file, facilitating the real-time transfer of data during acquisition" (Harvey, col. 9, lines 64-67). This citation clearly states that as data is being acquired, it is passed to the receiving end in real time.

Both of these citations clearly require writing the data from the file and at the same time shipping such data out in order to maintain its real time functionality.

Applicant states, "The Examiner also argues also that such queuing is inherent to HTTP, since HTTP is built on the top of TCP which allegedly has an outgoing queue. Applicant can locate no specific reference in Harvey to support this (see MPEP 2144.03 for reference to Examiner's duty). Applicant respectfully contends that such assertion by Examiner is not well known."

In response, Examiner points to MPEP2144.03 Section C, which states:

"To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention.")."

The Applicant has failed to specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action. Applicant has not stated why the fact(s) are not considered to be common knowledge. Applicant merely provides a general assertion that Applicant could not find reference to support Examiner's position in the Harvey reference. The Applicant hasn't even explained what "reference" applicant was searching for within Harvey. Therefore, the Applicant has failed to rebut the Examiner's position of the claim with any persuasive analysis. This form of argument is wholly ineffective in demonstrating error in the Examiner's position and as such, the rejection is maintained.

As MPEP 2144.03 states, the Examiner may rely on common knowledge in making a rejection in certain circumstances. The Examiner clearly explained what was being relied upon by the reference in order to support Examiner's fact of common knowledge.

In order to assist Applicant and expedite prosecution, Examiner provides two RFC's (RFC 793 TCP protocol and RFC 2616 HTTP protocol) to show that an output queue is in fact well known to be used in the transmission of data under these protocols.

Applicant argues, "even if correct, such HTTP queuing will also be inherent to the HTTP of the claimed invention, but this is clearly separate from the specific 'return-data-buffer that is claimed. If there is any doubt on this point, the difference is that the 'return-data-buffer is connected to the server-side script."

In response, Examiner notes that the name of the buffer has nothing to do with the functionality required by the claim. The claim simply requires data to be written to this buffer where the buffer is connected to a server-side script. It has been clearly shown by the rejection that Harvey disclosed a web server that transmits data to receiving devices using HTTP(s) (as one transfer protocol used by Harvey, Examiner notes that Harvey also explicitly disclosed the use of TCP at col. 9, lines 45-49) and as such concluded that the web server transmits the data outbound via an output queue. As explained above, the Applicant has not properly traversed Examiner's position that a device communicating with the TCP protocol uses an output queue in order to communicate with other devices on the network. Examiner notes that if software on a device writes data to an output queue, than that software is "connected" to the output queue. Applicant has failed to explain at all how such is not "connected" as Applicant asserts. As such the rejection is respectfully maintained.

Applicant's argues with respect to claim 24 that Harvey does not disclose a plurality of streamproducer elements as claimed.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As shown in the mappings, Harvey disclosed the system able to send streams to multiple remote delivery site computers (col. 5, lines 49-54) thereby requiring multiple instances to be created.

Applicant argues, "TCP is a packet-switching protocol, which is wholly different to the HTTP data streams that are being sent in the client-server model of the present invention" and that "the HTTP protocol [is] at a wholly different level to the TCP protocol. However, Applicant fails to explain the difference. Examiner agrees that the two protocols are on different layers. However this does not change the fact that the HTTP protocol is built on top of TCP, and relies on TCP to maintain flow control of data, which means the Transport layer looks to see if data is coming from more than one application and integrates each application's data into a stream for the physical network. As clearly shown by the TCP RFC, TCP uses output queues in order to transmit this data and as such, the received data is sent to an output queue for transmission.

Applicant's reiterated argument about the buffer being connected to the server side script have already been responded to above. For the same reasons, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, "queueing SEND requests is different from queuing data read from a source file into a buffer". In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon

which applicant relies (i.e., queuing SEND requests) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding Applicant's arguments with reference to paragraph [33]. the Examiner did not rely upon paragraph [33] in order to teach these limitations.

It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 19 uses the terminology "program storage medium". While Applicant's Specification recites this terminology, Applicants Specification does

not provide the meaning of the term and what it encompasses. MPEP § 608.01(o) states that the meaning of every term used in any of the claims should be apparent from the descriptive portion of the specification with clearly disclosure as to its import. Examiner notes that merely reiterating the term in the specification does not provide the proper antecedent basis for the terminology.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4 and 6-12 & 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent US 6,519,568 B1 to Harvey.

The applied reference has a common inventor and assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

5. Regarding Claims 1, 15, and 19, 23 & 24, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code for near real-time transfer of a data file from a first computer to a second computer without requiring extensive protocol customization on the second computer, (Abstract; Col. 3-7; and Col. 27-34), comprising:
a first computer having:

a connection to a computer network and operable to communicate over the computer network using a standard protocol, (Col. 4, lines 66-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-8);

a server side script operable to receive download requests from a second computer and, responsive to each download request from the second computer, operable to launch an http data streamproducer of the standard protocol and to read and write data over the computer network using the standard protocol, (Col. 3, lines 36-42; Col. 24, lines 60-67; and Col. 25, lines 1-6);

each httpstreamproducer operable to read a designated source file and simultaneously write data from the source file into a return-data-buffer connected to the server-side script, (Col. 3, lines 53-60; HTTP is built on top of the TCP Specification, which uses an output queue to send outgoing packets in a first-come first-serve order, Therefore the return-data-buffer is inherently disclosed by the use of HTTP);

a read-write mechanism allowing the httpstreamproducer to read data from the designated source file while the designated source file is being written by a data producing program, (Col. 3, lines 53-60 and Col. 25, lines 14-56);

wherein the server side script is further operable to transmit blocks of data from the plurality of httpstreamproducers over the connection, (Col. 3, lines 53-60; Col. 24, lines 60-67; and Col. 25, lines 1-6); and

a second computer having:

a connection to the computer network and operable to communicate over the computer network using the standard protocol, (Col. 4, lines 66-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-8);

a transaction controller operable to send data to and receive data from the server side script, and further operable to marshall the data to an appropriate transaction handler, (Col. 3, lines 42-48 and Col. 5, lines 20-35); and

a transactions handler class, each instance of which is operable to read and write data over the computer network using the standard protocol and to write blocks of data to a destination file simultaneously with receiving data from the computer network, (Col. 5, lines 20-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-13);

a data StreamHandler for interpreting a database stream received from the transaction handler, (Col. 5, lines 49-67 & Col. 6, lines 1-52).

Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Newly Amended Claims 1 & 15, and Original Claims 19, 23 & 24.

6. Regarding Claims 2, 8, 17 and 18, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code wherein the first computer further comprises:

a webserver for transmitting a webpage containing a list of files for download by other computers, (Col. 4, lines 61-65 and Col. 28, lines 31- 39);

the second computer further comprises:

a webbrowser for displaying the webpage containing the list of files available for download, (Col. 20, lines 52-60; Fig. 16; and Col. 21, lines 44-49); and a trusted applet operable, in response to a user selecting a file from the list, to create a transaction controller instance operable to manage a plurality of file transfer threads, wherein in each file transfer thread, in response to the request from a user to download a file, the transaction controller instance is operable to create a transaction handler instance for receiving data from the first computer, (Col. 3, lines 42-48; Col. 5, lines 20- 48; Col. 19, lines 59-67; Col. 20, lines 1-50); Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claims 2, 8, 17 and 18.

7. Regarding Claims 3 and 9, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code wherein the second computer further comprises:

at least one stream handler class having at least one file interaction method for

Art Unit: 2443

performing a file operation selected from the set creating a file, opening a file and writing to a file, (Col. 24, lines 60-67 and Col. 25, lines 1-37); and wherein the transaction handler instance creates a stream handler instance appropriate for the file selected by the user, (Col. 24, lines 60-67 and Col. 25, lines 1- 37).

Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claims 3 and 9.

8. Regarding Claim 4, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code wherein the standard protocol is http, (Col. 5, lines 5-8). Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claim 4.

9. Regarding Claims 10-12, 20 and 22, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code wherein the destination is a data file, (per pending Claims 10 & 20), (Col. 25, lines 33-36), an application program that is a data consumer, (per pending Claim 11), (Col. 4, lines 45-55), or a database, (per pending Claims 12 & 22), (Col. 4, lines 56-60). Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claims 10-12, 20 and 22.

10. Regarding Claim 6, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code wherein the server-side script implements an http GET command and the download request is an invocation of the http GET command of the server-side script,

(Col. 5, lines 5-8). Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claim 6.

11. Regarding Claim 7, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code further comprising an httpStreamProducer class and wherein the httpStreamProducer is an instance of the httpStreamProducer class, (Col. 3, lines 60-67 and Col. 28, lines 31-55). Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Claim 7.

12. Regarding Newly Amended Claim 16 and Original Claim 21, Harvey discloses a system, method and computer-readable code further comprising launching an application, (data streamhandler), on the client-side wherein blocks of data are transferred upon receipt of the same, (Col. 4, lines 45-55 & Col. 6, lines 1-52). Therefore, this reference may reasonably be read to teach or describe every element or claim limitation of Newly Amended Claim 16 and Original Claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-6 6-12, 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Val et al. (US 20050198364) in view of RFC793 – Transmission Control Protocol, hereinafter referred to by "TCP Specification".

13. Regarding claim 1, Val disclosed a system for near real-time transfer of a datafile from a first computer to a second computer without requiring extensive protocol customization on the second computer and, comprising:
a first computer having:

a connection to a computer network and operable to communicate over the computer network using a standard protocol (Fig. 3, connection between client and server using one of many standard protocols as listed in Fig. 3);

a server side script, responsive to a down-load request from a second computer, operable to launch an http data streamproducer of the standard protocol and to read and write data over the computer network using the standard protocol ([0012], [0032], client requests stream, server provides stream, clearly requiring the server to produce the stream to send);

the http streamproducer operable to read a designed source file and simultaneously write data from the source file and a read-while-write mechanism allowing the http streamproducer to read data from the designated source file while the designated source file is being written by a data producer program ([0010], Val disclosed the ability to perform the functions with live data, which requires reading the live data from a source file while it is being written and writing the live data in

accordance with an outgoing data stream as described in [0012], [0056], Val also disclosed performing the functions using many types of media data such as video and audio, all requiring reading from a source file and writing the data stream out to the requesting client; [0035], Val disclosed the HTTP protocol built on top of TCP); and a second computer (Val, [0033] client) having:

a connection to the computer network and operable to communicate over the computer network using the standard protocol (Fig. 3, connection between client and server using one of many standard protocols as listed in Fig. 3);

a transaction handler class, each instance of which is operable to read and write data over the computer network using the standard protocol and to write blocks of data to a destination simultaneously with receiving data from the computer network (Val, [0033], Val disclosed the client receiving a data stream from the server, requiring the client to write the blocks from the data stream to memory/database in order to actually use the data to, for example, watch video, or listen to a song); and

a data StreamHandler for interpreting a database stream received from the transaction handler (Val, [0058], Val disclosed the client receiving the data stream in order to control it, thereby requiring a StreamHandler in order to make sense of the data stream and allow the user to, for example, PLAY the media from the stream).

Val did not explicitly state the data read from the source file is written into a return-data-buffer connected to the server-side script.

In an analogous art, the TCP Specification disclosed a specific way for how TCP handles outgoing data by using an outgoing queue in order for outgoing SENDS to be

served in a first come-first served order, thereby queuing and serving them in the order as received (TCP Specification, [0047]).

Since Val indicated that the HTTP protocol is built on top of the TCP protocol, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to search the prior art in order to determine well known ways for how TCP handles outgoing packets. Val also disclosed that the system can handle multiple data connections at once (Val, [0053]). This also would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to search for how TCP handles multiple connections.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the TCP implementation, as described in the TCP Specification, into the teachings of Val, in order to follow the well known TCP protocol that Val suggests, thereby making it easier for customers who are already following well known TCP standards to use the system of Val without having to perform any extensive implementation, thereby making the system of Val more desirable to use.

14. Regarding claim 3, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, including wherein the second computer further comprises at least one stream handler class having at least one file interaction method for performing a file operation selected from the set of steps comprising creating a file, opening a file and writing to a file; and wherein the transaction handler instance creates the stream handler instance appropriate for the file selected by the user ([0061], client receives the

media data which requires a stream handler in order to properly create a file at the client end in order for the client to be able to control).

15. Regarding claim 4, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, including wherein the standard protocol is http (Val, [0062]).

16. Regarding claim 5, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1.

Val and TCP did not explicitly state wherein the standard protocol is WAP.

Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP § 2144.03) that "streaming data to a client using the WAP protocol" was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Since WAP was a well known protocol at the time the invention was made used for streaming data, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate using the most advantageous protocol for wireless devices, i.e. WAP in order to stream data to the client in accordance with the teachings of Val and TCP Spec in order to provide a more scalable system that allows all types of devices to use the system, thereby increasing desirability of use by customers. The Applicant is entitled to traverse any/all official notice taken in this action according to MPEP § 2144.03, namely, "if applicant traverses such an assertion, the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position". However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also *In re Boon*, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or

argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, *In re Boon*, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in *Ahlert*, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed". Further note that 37 CFR § 1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight.

17. Regarding claim 6, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, including wherein the server-side script implements an http GET command and the download request is an invocation of the http GET command of the server-side script (Val, [0058]-[0059]).

18. Claims 2, 7-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Val et al. (US 20050198364) in view of RFC793 – Transmission Control Protocol, hereinafter referred to by "TCP Specification" and in further view of Lindblad et al. (US 6225993).

19. Regarding claims 2 and 8, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, including wherein the first computer comprises a web server (Val,

Art Unit: 2443

[0056]) that provides a web page that identifies web page files containing the desired media by clients (Val, [0057]) and also allows for employing the HTTP protocol to communicate media commands from a browser application or browser plugin to the server (Val, [0058]) as well as a browser on the client side for allowing selection of the desired media (Val, [0057]-[0058]).

Val and the TCP Specification did not explicitly state the client including a trusted applet operable, in response to a user selecting a file from the list, to create a transaction controller instance operable to manage a plurality of file transfer threads, wherein in each file transfer thread, in response to the request from a user to download a file, the transaction controller instance is operable to create a transaction handler instance for receiving data from the first computer.

In an analogous art, Lindblad disclosed a system and method for transmitting data streams in which an applet is used as a plug-in for a web browser, the applet being used to control the stream (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45), the applet being a Java applet, clearly requiring some form of transaction controller instance in order to handle transfer threads to download a file.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Val and TCP Specification and Lindblad since the combined teaching of Val and TCP Specification suggests the use of web browser plugins and Lindblad provides a specific type of plugin.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Lindblad's applet as the web browser plugin of

Val and TCP Specification in order to provide the designer with an easy way to incorporate motion video titles into HTML pages (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 33-38).

20. Regarding claim 7, Val and TCP Specification disclosed the limitations as described in claim 4.

Val and TCP did not explicitly state comprising an HttpStreamProducer class and wherein the HttpStreamProducer is an instance of the HttpStreamProducer class.

In an analogous art, Lindblad disclosed a system and method for transmitting data streams in which an applet is used as a plug-in for a web browser, the applet being used to control the stream (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a Java applet that handles a data stream would require a stream producer class and each instance of the same applet would call an instance of this stream producer class.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Val and TCP Specification and Lindblad since the combined teaching of Val and TCP Specification suggests the use of web browser plug-ins and Lindblad provides a specific type of plug-in.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Lindblad's applet as the web browser plug-in of Val and TCP Specification in order to provide the designer with an easy way to incorporate motion video titles into HTML pages (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 33-38).

21. Regarding claim 9, Val, TCP Specification, and Lindblad disclosed the limitations as described in claim 8, including wherein the second computer further comprises a datastream handler class having a method for receiving data from the transaction handler instance and for writing data to a destination (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45, By Lindblad disclosing a Java applet for receiving the data stream, this applet must include such instances for handling the stream and writing it to a destination in order for the user to use the data, i.e. watch a video).

22. Regarding claim 10, Val, TCP Specification, and Lindblad disclosed the limitations as described in claim 9 including wherein the destination is a data file (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45, the only way the data can be read is from a data file, i.e. data).

23. Regarding claim 11, Val, TCP Specification, and Lindblad disclosed the limitations as described in claim 9 including wherein the destination is an application program that is a data consumer (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45).

Regarding claim 12, Val, TCP Specification, and Lindblad disclosed the limitations as described in claim 11 including wherein the destination is a database (Lindblad, col. 2, lines 28-45, the received data stream must be written to memory, i.e. database).

Art Unit: 2443

24. Claims 15-18 recite a method for performing limitations that are substantially similar to the limitations as described in claims 1-12 and are therefore rejected under the same rationale. Claims 19-23 recite an article of manufacture performing the limitations that are substantially similar to the limitations as described in claims 1-12 and are therefore rejected under the same rationale. Claim 24 includes a system with limitations that are substantially similar to the limitations as described in claims 1-12 and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2443

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J Bret Dennison/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443